



JRC SCIENTIFIC AND POLICY REPORTS

Scientific, Technical and Economic Committee for Fisheries (STECF)

DCF- update of MS Annual Report Guidelines, review amended LIT NP and Croatian NP for 2013 (STECF-13-07)

Edited by Eskild Kirkegaard & Fabrizio Natale

This report was reviewed by the STECF during its' 42nd plenary meeting
held from 8 to 12 April 2013 in Brussels, Belgium

Report EUR 25972 EN

European Commission
Joint Research Centre
Institute for the Protection and Security of the Citizen

Contact information

STECF secretariat

Address: TP 051, 21027 Ispra (VA), Italy

E-mail: stecf-secretariat@jrc.ec.europa.eu

Tel.: 0039 0332 789343

Fax: 0039 0332 789658

<https://stecf.jrc.ec.europa.eu/home>

<http://ipsc.jrc.ec.europa.eu/>

<http://www.jrc.ec.europa.eu/>

Legal Notice

Neither the European Commission nor any person acting on behalf of the Commission is responsible for the use which might be made of this publication. This report does not necessarily reflect the view of the European Commission and in no way anticipates the Commission's future policy in this area.

Europe Direct is a service to help you find answers to your questions about the European Union

Freephone number (*): 00 800 6 7 8 9 10 11

(*) Certain mobile telephone operators do not allow access to 00 800 numbers or these calls may be billed.

A great deal of additional information on the European Union is available on the Internet. It can be accessed through the Europa server <http://europa.eu/>

JRC 81594

EUR 25972 EN

ISBN 978-92-79-29906-3

ISSN 1831-9424

doi:10.2788/90141

Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union, 2013

© European Union, 2013

Reproduction is authorised provided the source is acknowledged

How to cite this report:

Scientific, Technical and Economic Committee for Fisheries (STECF) – DCF- update of MS Annual Report Guidelines, review amended LIT NP and Croatian NP for 2013 (STECF-13-07). 2013. Publications Office of the European Union, Luxembourg, EUR 25972 EN, JRC 81594, 50 pp.

Printed in Italy

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Review of DC MAP – Part 1 (STECF-13-07)	4
Conclusions of the STECF	4
Expert Working Group EWG-13-02 report.....	5
1 Terms of Reference for EWG-13-02.....	6
2 TOR 1: Evaluation of the Croatian National Programme 2013	6
3 TOR 2: Evaluation of the proposed amendments to the Lithuanian National Programme for 2013.....	6
4 TOR 3: Update of the Annual Report Guidelines	7
5 Annex I. Review of CROATIAN MULTI-ANNUAL PROGRAMME FOR COLLECTION OF FISHERIES DATA 2012 – 2013	8
6 Annex II Evaluation of Lithuanian NP 2013 update.....	18
7 Annex III Updated Guidelines for the submission of Annual Reports on the National Data Collection Programmes under Council Regulation (EC) 199/2008, Commission Regulation (EC) 665/2008 and Commission Decision 2010/93/EU	21
8 EWG-13-02 List of Participants.....	48
9 List of Background Documents.....	50

SCIENTIFIC, TECHNICAL AND ECONOMIC COMMITTEE FOR FISHERIES (STECF)

Review of DC MAP – Part 1 (STECF-13-07)

**THIS REPORT WAS REVIEWED DURING THE PLENARY MEETING HELD IN Brussels,
Belgium, 8-12 April 2013**

Conclusions of the STECF

STECF endorses the findings of the EWG 13-02 DC-MAP 1 meeting concerning the update of Annual Report Guidelines, the review of the amended Lithuanian National Programme for 2013 and the review of the Croatian National Programme for 2013.

REPORT TO THE STECF

EXPERT WORKING GROUP ON Review of DC MAP – Part 1 (EWG-13-02)

Ispra, Italy, 11 – 15 March 2013

This report does not necessarily reflect the view of the STECF and the European Commission and in no way anticipates the Commission's future policy in this area

1 TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR EWG-13-02

STECF is requested to:

1. Evaluation of the Croatian National Programme 2013
2. Evaluation of the proposed amendments to the Lithuanian National Programme for 2013
3. Update of the Annual Report Guidelines

2 TOR 1: EVALUATION OF THE CROATIAN NATIONAL PROGRAMME 2013

EC requested the EWG 13-02 to review the NP 2013 of Croatia. For this issue, reports of two pre-screeners were made available to the EWG 13-02 .

The EWG 13-02 underlines the very high quality of the Croatian NP, in particular taking into account that it is the first NP provided by the Member State. The proposal gives evidence of a complete and mature understanding of the DCF regulation and its requirements. Fisheries and aquaculture sectors are well described and give realistic aspects of the existing et of the potential difficulties which could be met. Hopefully the execution of the NP leads to reliable results

The screening of this first NP has been carried out with meticulousness, to provide Croatia with relevant comments to still improve the quality of its NP and its fulfilments with DCF criteria or guidelines. The Croatia national proposal for the collection of fisheries data was in general accordance with Council Regulation EC 199/08 and Commission Decision 93/2010. The NP was well structured according to the last version of the guidelines for NPs. It will require only few changes. In particular MS should pay attention to the naming conventions and last recommendations agreed by RCM Med&BS (2009, 2010 and 2011 reports) and follow the standard codes as reported in the Commission Decision 93/2010/EC.

Comments by EWG-13-02 are compiled in Annex I.

3 TOR 2: EVALUATION OF THE PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE LITHUANIAN NATIONAL PROGRAMME FOR 2013

EWG has reviewed the updated National Programme 2013 forLithuania based on the pre-evaluation report.

Lithuania has proposed changes to the NP 2013 in the general, biological (III.C, III.D, III.E, III.G) and economic modules.

The defined amendments that require submission of an updated NP to the Commission are given in the “Guidelines for the amendment of National Programmes 2011-13 for the year 2013” (Ares(2012)847827 - 11/07/2012"). These include the following:

- Addition/removal of surveys or pilot studies;
- Modification of surveys or pilot studies that have an effect on the temporal aspects (continuity of survey series), spatial aspects (coverage), technical aspects (change in gear, technology) or financial aspects of the National Programme;
- A modification in sampling design or any other change in methodology e.g. a change fromprobability to non-probability sampling;
- A request for derogation.

EWG agrees with the pre-evaluation carried out by independent experts that the proposed changes are minor and are not covered in the above specification. The resubmission of the NP was therefore not necessary.

Nevertheless, there are still some minor issues that could be improved for future submissions. These are presented in the pre-evaluation report in annex II.

4 TOR 3: UPDATE OF THE ANNUAL REPORT GUIDELINES

The EWG 13-02 updated the guidelines based on inputs from experts conducted under an *ad hoc* contract with the Commission. The proposed updated guidelines is presented in annex III.

5 ANNEX I. REVIEW OF CROATIAN MULTI-ANNUAL PROGRAMME FOR COLLECTION OF FISHERIES DATA 2012 – 2013

General considerations

EWG underlines the very high quality of the Croatian NP, in particular taking into account that it is the first NP provided by the Member State. The proposal gives evidence of a complete and mature understanding of the DCF regulation and its requirements. Fisheries and aquaculture sectors are well described and give realistic aspects of the existing et of the potential difficulties which could be met. Hopefully the execution of the NP leads to reliable results

The screening of this first NP has been carried out with meticulousness, to provide Croatia with relevant comments to still improve the quality of its NP and its fulfilments with DCF criteria or guidelines. The Croatia national proposal for the collection of fisheries data was in general accordance with Council Regulation EC 199/2008 and Commission Decision 93/2010. The NP was well structured according to the last version of the guidelines for NPs. It will require only few changes. In particular MS should pay attention to the naming conventions and last recommendations agreed by RCM Med&BS (2009, 2010 and 2011 reports) and follow the standard codes as reported in the Commission Decision 93/2010/EC.

I and II.A - General framework and organisation of the NP

Good presentation of the context and clear description of the national organisation set up and of the role of each partner of the NP.

II.B - International coordination

Standard table II.B.1 should report all the international co-ordination meetings (e.g. PGMed, Study Groups, Regional Co-ordination Long Distance Fishery, ICCAT WS, GFCM Subcommittee meetings etc.), and all the workshops that will be attended for the correct implementation of the DCF. Each MS should report the full list of eligible meetings and thereafter indicates which are considered “useful” for their NP. Is reported in the Guidelines: *“It is advised to copy here the official eligible list of meetings given by the European Commission.....Once the EC has provided the full list of eligible meetings, MS should update table II.B.1 with the appropriate list and fill the column 'Eligible under DCF'.”*

III.A General description of the fishing sector

Informative description is provide on national fisheries. But Table III.A.1 is not completely coherent with this description, for demersal and tunas fisheries are real components of the sector (yes to be put in the cells).

See also comment on the 200t threshold in section III.C.

III.B - Fleet economic variables

No remarks.

III.C - Biological - Métier Related Variables

a) Codification and naming convention

- MS stated that *“The métiers presented in ST III.C.1 follow the codification and naming convention adopted in 2008 by the working bodies of the European Commission for the Mediterranean Sea”*. In fact MS performed the ranking system at national level with its own coding of national métiers. However all tables III.C presented several inconsistencies. As reported in the Guidelines and Procedures for NP (SGNR 09-03) *“...for regions covered by a RCM, the fishing grounds, mesh size ranges and métiers naming convention agreed by the RCMs have to be used. Refer to the most recent RCM reports for the exact definitions to use.”* Below are detailed the main inconsistencies.

- In Table III.C.1, undercolumn “Region”, MS should report the correct name of the Region “Mediterranean and Black Sea”.

- In Table III.C.1, undercolumn “Gear LVL 4”, is reported the code of some gears that are not present in the Appendix IV of the EU Decision 93/2010 (i.e. OATF, GTN, TB and HAR).

MS is requested to check it, and report the correct code of the mentioned gears (or report these gears under MISC), following the agreed convention. MS should adjust consequently the Table.

- In Table III.C.1, under column “Metier LVL6”, MS should strictly follow the output of the RCMMed&BS 2009 where the definition at level 6 of nets, all trawl types, purse seines and lampara nets was defined in most cases at the minimum mesh sizes defined by Regulation 1967/2006. Following this issue the reference list of métiers agreed at Regional level (RCMMed&BS 2009) should be used for the selection of the métiers to sample (see table below). MS should adjust consequently the Table:

- Table III.C.1, GNS_DEF_>=10_0_0, GTR_DEF_>=80_0_0, SB_SV_DEF_>=10_0_0, FPO_DEF_64_0_0, PS_LPF_>=68_0_0, DRB_MOL_>=56_0_0, GNS_SLP_>=32_0_0, TBB_DEF_>=24_0_0, all these métiers do not present the correct mesh size agreed at Regional level. MS should check it and report the correct mesh size agreed at Regional level (RCM Med&BS 2009).
- Table III.C.1, PS_DEF_>=10_0_0, FPO_CRU_36_0_0, HAR_FIF_0_0_0, OATF_0_0_0, GTN_CEP_32_0, TB_DEF_24_0_0, GTN_DEF_40_0, SB_SV_SPF_>=16_0_0, OTM_SPF_>=18_0_0, all these métiers do not exist in the Appendix IV of the EU Decision 93/2010 and are not present in the agreement reached at Regional level (RCMMed&BS 2009). MS should check it, replace with the correct code, or insert the cited métier under MISC.

- All the Miscellanea, MIS_DEF_0_0_0, MIS_MOL_0_0_0, MIS_CRU_0_0_0, should be grouped under the common items MISC, and thereafter if sorted by the ranking system, defined at National level. Generally, one métier defined at level 6 of the matrix in Appendix IV (1 to 5) of Commission Decision 2010/93/EU may be further disaggregated into several more precise strata, i.e. distinguishing different target species. Such disaggregation should respect the two conditions given in Commission Decision 2010/93/EU Chapter III.B1.2(2). It is possible that two or more métiers that are merged (e.g. a métier selected by the ranking system merged with others not selected) may be subsequently split into more precise strata referenced at target species level. Use table III.C.2 to specify which, if any, métiers have been split and how these are labeled in subsequent tables. The new métiers defined should appear in the table III.C.3.

- The following table reports the correct naming convention for the Mediterranean and Black Sea métier (ref. RCMMed&BS 2009).

Metier coding	Metier naming
DRB MOL 0 0 0	Boat dredge for molluscs
FPN LPF 0 0 0	Stationary uncovered pound nets for large pelagic
FPO DEF 0 0 0	Pot and Traps for demersal species
FYK CAT 0 0 0	Fyke nets for eels
FYK DEF 0 0 0	Fyke nets for demersal species
GND DEF 0 0 0	Driftnets for demersal fish
GND SPF 0 0 0	Driftnets for small pelagic fish
GNS DEF 360-400 0 0*	Set gillnets for demersal fish
GNS DEF >=16 0 0	Set gillnets for demersal fish according meshsize regulation
GNS SLP >=16 0 0	Set gillnets for small and large pelagics according meshsize regulation
GTR DEF >=16 0 0	Set trammel nets for demersal species according meshsize regulation
LA SLP 14 0 0	Lampara nets according meshsize regulation
LHP-LHM FIF 0 0 0	Hand and Pole lines for finfish
LHP-LHM CEP 0 0 0	Hand and Pole lines for cephalopods
LLD LPF 0 0 0	Drifting longlines for large pelagic
LLS DEF 0 0 0	Set longlines for demersal fish
LTL LPF 0 0 0	Trolling lines for large pelagic
OTB DEF >=40 0 0	Bottom otter trawl for demersal species
OTB DWS >=40 0 0	Bottom otter trawl for deep water species
OTB MDD >=40 0 0	Bottom otter trawl for mixed demersal and deep water species
OTM MPD >=13 19 0 0*	Pelagic trawl according meshsize regulation
OTM MPD >=20 0 0	Midwater otter trawl for mixed demersal and pelagic species
PS LPF 14 0 0	Purse seine for large pelagic
PS SPF >=14 0 0	Purse seine for small pelagics according meshsize regulation
PTM SPF >=20 0 0	Pelagic pair trawl for small pelagic species
SB-SV DEF 0 0 0	Beach and boat seines for demersal species
TBB DEF 0 0 0	Beam trawl for demersal trawling
MISC	Miscellaneous metiers (defined at national level)

- MS should provide in the text a more accurate descriptions of métiers for which derogations are requested.

b) Selection of métiers to sample

- In the table III.C.1, all the métiers selected by the ranking systems should be clearly indicated.

According to Commission Decision 93/2010, all metiers belonging to the top 90% should be selected for sampling purpose. Only metiers which not belong to the top 90% in terms of total effort, value or landing should be deleted from the sample plane. For metiers variables there is not a threshold of 200 tonnes allowing to ask for applying exemption rules (as written by error by MS in section III.A). If a metier has been selected for ones of the above mentioned criteria Yes (Y) should be reported in the proper column(s) and thereafter an explanation for a possible derogation should be described.

MS is requested to carefully check the results and put in evidence the metier belonging to the established threshold of the 90%.

- In the table III.C.1, the so called columns “Sum of %Effort”, “Sum of %Catch” “Sum of %value” should be deleted: these columns are not part of the Guidelines and Procedures for NP (SGNR 09-03). MS should report, under the columns “Selected Effort”, “ Selected Landings”, “Selected Value”, “Selected Other”, “Selected Discards”, if a métier has been selected for ones of the above mentioned criteria and/or other criteria (e.g. under the column “Selected Value” enter Yes or No if the métier has been selected according to the ranking system based on the value variable).

MS should check the results and rewrite the Table.

- According to Commission Decision 93/2010, all MSs performing the ranking system should use the average values of the 2 previous years. MS clearly explained that, as starting point, 2009 was the only good set of data that could be used. For the future MS is recommended to use the most update set of values (i.e. landing values, tons, fishing days) in order to select the metiers to be sampled.

- MS is requested, also in the text of the NP, to report the correct name of the gears and the metier LVL6 as present in the Appendix IV of the EU Decision 93/2010 and agreed during the RCMMed&BS 2009.

- Regarding discards, should be recalled that collection of discards data is compulsory for all the metiers selected by the ranking system (EU Decision 93/2010). However, during RCMMed&BS 2010 has been made a distinction between métiers that have considerable amount of discards and métiers for which discards can be considered scarce or absent.

During RCMMed&BS 2010, a table has been created to provide justification for not sampling discards of métiers for which discards fraction is absent or negligible. For these métiers MS need not ask for derogations.

For some others métiers, discarding level is assessed as significant and concerned métier must be sampled adequately and every year for discards.

For some other métiers discards behavior must be documented and references should be provided in order to request derogation and this should be done at national level.

MS is requested to check and strictly follow the RCMMed&BS 2010 output regarding the métier discards behavior and adjust consequently the discards sampling plan in the text of the NP.

- MS is requested to clarify whether recommendation of level 7 on large pelagic species has been followed in accordance with the ICCAT recommendation (see also RCMMed&BS 2009 and 2010 agreement). In this case data should be reported as: LLD_LPF_0_0_0 SWO; LLD_LPF_0_0_0 BFT; LLD_LPF_0_0_0 ALB, and Table III_C_2 should be updated consequently. Background: During the PGMed 2009 was discussed the possibility to split drifting longlines targeting large pelagics into 3 further metiers on the basis of the target species: Thunnusthynnus (BFT), Thunnusalalunga (ALB) and Xiphiasgladius (SWO).

A discussion followed on the possibility in setting the 3 métiers either at level 6, based on hook size ranges, or at level 7 based on the targeted species; it was finally decided that the 3 métiers should be set at level 7, as the relevant RFO (i.e. ICCAT) collects information based on the targeted species. In order to ensure a regional coordination in the sampling of the drifting longlines, PGMed recommends Member States to include in their national programme the following metiers at level 7 of the matrix:

LLD_LPF_0_0_0(BFT)

LLD_LPF_0_0_0(ALB)

LLD_LPF_0_0_0(SWO)

So the RCMMed&BS 2009 requested the definition at level 7 of drifting longlines (based on the target species BFT, ALB, SWO). RCM Med&BS 2009 clarified that the métier ranking is made at level 6. However, since the proposed métiers at level 7 were selected at regional level, it was agreed that it is important to follow them, especially the ones concerning large pelagic fish.

c) Sampling stratification and allocation scheme

- Column titled “MS participating in sampling” in table III.C.3 does not reflect regional sampling programme for métiers targeting large pelagic species. Concerning the sampling scheme for large species, MS should follow the agreement reached at Regional level. Background: In the Guidelines is reported “If the metier is sampled according to a regionally co-ordinated programme, give the names of all participating Member States. If the metier is sampled unilaterally, give the name of the single participating Member State.” In its 2008 report, RCMMed&BS identified the regional coordination for sampling large pelagic catches as an very important issue for task-sharing in the Mediterranean. During 2008 and 2009 the RCM carried on its work to propose a regional sampling plan for these species to include in the NP 2011-2013. In 2009 the RCMMed&BS has prepared a regional protocol for the collection of both length and stock related parameters of large pelagic species. RCMMed&BS 2009 recommended that the protocol (i.e. the different tables with the number of specimens to sample) prepared by the group should be used for length sampling and stock related samples respectively. The number of samples to be collected will be revised yearly during the PGMed and RCMMed&BS meetings and each MS should adjust his NP accordingly.

In this case Croatia should add the name of the countries participating in the sampling of métier (PS) targeting large pelagic species (i.e. MLT-FRA-ESP-ITA-CYP-GRE).

- In Table III.C.3, under column “Region”, MS should report the correct name of the Region “Mediterranean and Black Sea”.

- In Table III.C.3, under column “Metier LVL6”, MS should strictly follow the output of the RCMMed&BS 2009 where the definition at level 6 of nets, all trawl types, purse seines and lampara nets was defined in most cases at the minimum mesh sizes defined by Regulation 1967/2006, except for the relevant métiers of Black Sea. Following this issue the reference list of metiers, agreed at Regional level (with the correct naming convention) during the RCMMed&BS 2009, should be used. GNS_DEF_>=10_0_0, GTR_DEF_>=80_0_0, SB_SV_DEF_>=10_0_0, PS_LPF_>=68_0_0: all these métiers do not present the correct mesh size agreed at Regional level. MS should check it and report the correct mesh size agreed at Regional level.

- In Table III.C.3, under column “Sampling Strategy”, MS should report only one sampling scheme for row. As reported in the Guidelines and Procedures for NP (SGNR 09-03) “*if more than one sampling strategy is applied to a métier then separate rows should be used for each strategy that is reported*” (i.e. “concurrent sampling at markets”, “concurrent sampling at sea” or “other”). Another way is to consider concurrent sampling as an unique strategy applied at sea and on shore. A row is therefore adequate.

- In Table III.C.3, the column called “Sampling frame codes” is empty; MS should use and refer to a common reference code of the sampling frames defined in table III.C.4 (see Guidelines and Procedures for NP, SGNR 09-03).

- In the text of the NP, MS is requested to clearly and better explain why eel is not considered relevant for sampling purposes. Eel is Group 1 species and is under Recovery Plan. As also recalled by the MS, RCMMed&BS recommends that all the Mediterranean countries that are not performing biological samplings on eel (*Anguilla anguilla*) in Mediterranean area should present their grounds for not doing it.

- By applying concurrent sampling, MS must sample at least all GR1 species and main GR2 species, without considering the volume of the total annual landings of each species (as done by error with the

200t threshold in section III.A): MS is requested to re-examine the status of *Parapenaeus longirostris*, *Octopus vulgaris*, *Trachurus* spp and *Scomber japonicus*, regarding the métiers variables and their insertion in Table III.C.5 and according also that these species are present in Table III.E.1 on stocks variables (in grey but with triannual update).

- Column titled “MS participating in sampling” in table III.C.4 does not reflect regional sampling programme for métiers targeting large pelagic species. Concerning the sampling scheme for large species, MS should follow the agreement reached at Regional level. (See Background information above). Also in this case, Croatia should add the name of the countries participating in the sampling of métier (i.e. PS) targeting large pelagic species (i.e. MLT-FRA-ESP-ITA-CYP-GRE).

- In Table III.C.4, under column “Region”, MS should report the correct name of the Region “Mediterranean and Black Sea”.

- In Table III.C.4, the column called “Sampling frame codes” is empty; MS should use and refer to a common reference code of the sampling frames defined in table III.C.3 (see Guidelines and Procedures for NP, SGNR 09-03).

- Column titled “MS participating in sampling” in table III.C.5 does not reflect regional sampling programme for large pelagic species (i.e. *Thunnus thynnus*). Concerning the sampling scheme for large species, MS should follow the agreement reached at Regional level. (See Background information above). In this case Croatia should add the name of the countries participating in the sampling of *Thunnus thynnus* (i.e. ESP-FRA-ITA-MTL-SLO-CYP-GRE).

- In Table III.C.5, under column “Region”, MS should report the correct name of the Region “Mediterranean and Black Sea”.

- In Table III.C.5, under column “Species”, MS should report the complete name of the species and not only the genus (i.e. *Eledone* spp.).

- In Table III.C.5, the precision level Required for length analysis is 12,5% (Commission Decision 2010/93/EU).

- In Table III.C.5, under column “Planned minimum no. of fish to be measured/aged at national level” MS should report only the planned number of fish for length analysis (age is a stock related variable). As reported in the Guidelines and Procedures for NP (SGNR 09-03) this column should report only “the planned minimum number of fish to be measured at the national level.” MS should adjust consequently the Table.

- In Table III.C.5 under column “Planned minimum no. of fish to be measured/aged at the regional level”, MS should report the planned number agreed at Regional level (RCMMed&BS 2011) for large pelagic species (i.e. *Thunnus thynnus*). This column should be corrected following the agreement reached at Regional level.

d) III.C.4 Data Presentation

Under this paragraph should be reported when the final checked and validated data could be available to all potential end users and not only to GFCM working groups (i.e. ICCAT, EU, SGMED, RCM Med&BS).

e) III.C.5 Regional coordination

Some recommendations of RCM MED&BS are listed but they are already old. MS should implement also more recent ones (see 2010 and 2011 RCM reports).

f) III.C. 6 Derogation and Non Conformities

MS is invited to provide more detailed information (e.g. analysis of cost effectiveness, pilot study) on the reasons supporting such a request for derogation.

III.D - Biological variables – Recreational fisheries

MS should clarify if recreational fisheries for eel exist or not in the country. Moreover, MS is requested to clearly and better explain why recreational fishery for eel is not considered relevant for sampling purposes.

III.E - Biological - stock-related variables

- In Table III.E.1, under column “Species”, MS should report the complete name of the species and not only the genus (i.e. *Eledone* spp., *Lophius* spp., *Trachurus* spp.). Under the same column, MS should add all the shark species as reported in the Appendix VII of the EU Decision 93/2010. Moreover, all the species that are not present in the G1, G2 (Appendix VII of the EU Decision 93/2010) and/or G3 (as agreed at Regional Level) should be deleted from the table (e.g. *Lepidorhombus* spp., *Triglidae*, *Pecten jacobaeus*, *Phycis* spp., *Ruditapes decussatus*, etc.). MS should adjust consequently the Table.

- In Table III.E.1, MS should add both the columns “Region” and “RFMO” and thereafter fulfil it following the Guidelines and Procedures for NP (SGNR 09-03).

- In Table III.E.1, under column “Area/Stock”, MS should delete *Mediterranean*.

- In Table III.E.1, under columns “Share in EU TAC %” and “Share in EU landing %”, MS should report the percentage contribution of large pelagic species.

- In Table III.E.1, MS should delete the three columns called “Age”, “Weight, sex-ratio and maturity” and “Fecundity”. These columns are not part of the Guidelines and Procedures for NP (SGNR 09-03). MS should adjust consequently the Table.

- In Table III.E.1, MS should add the column “Selected for sampling” and thereafter indicate with ‘Yes’ or ‘No’ whether the species/stock has been selected for sampling, as requested from the Guidelines. MS should adjust consequently the Table.

- Table III.E.2: the evaluation of the stock variables (age, weight, sex and maturity) for all G1 species, with the exception of large pelagic and sharks species, is every year.

Evaluation of the stock variables (age, weight, sex and maturity), for all G2 and G3 species, plus shark's and large pelagic species, is every three years. MS should adjust consequently the Table III.E.2. See also comments in section III.C for adding *Parapenaeus longirostris* and *Octopus vulgaris* in Table III.E.2, as no derogations are requested for these two species (as opposed to *Trachurus* and *Scomber japonicus* for which it is the case), and because MS mentions in the text of the NP specific interest for collection of stocks variables at least for *Octopus vulgaris* (Table III.E.1 not very clear for *Parapenaeus longirostris*).

- In Table III.E.3, under column "Region", MS should report the correct name of the Region "Mediterranean and Black Sea".

- In Table III.E.3, under column "Variable", MS should report only one variable for row (e.g. length@age). As reported from the guidelines "Use one of the codes given as a footnote of table III.E.3. For maturity, fecundity and sex ratio, a choice may be made between reference to age or length following the Commission Decision 2008/949/EC* Chapter III.B2.4.3.". MS should adjust consequently the Table.

- In Table III.E.3, under column "Planned minimum no. of fish to be measured at national level" MS should report only the planned number of fish to be measured. As reported in the Guidelines and Procedures for NP (SGNR 09-03) under this column should be reported only "the planned minimum number of fish to be measured at the national level." MS should adjust consequently the Table.

III.E.4 Data Presentation

- In this paragraph should be reported when the final checked and validated data could be available to all potential end users and not only to GFCM working groups (i.e. ICCAT, EU, SGMED, RCM Med&BS).

III.F - Transversal data

- The Croatian data on capacity will be calculated and not be estimated according the description (just about the wording). In the future Croatia should use "calculation" and not estimation in this section.

- Under the header capacity some information is given that could be presented better in the general part of the transversal variables chapter or in other subchapter, as it does not or not only belong to capacity.

Example:

"Transversal variables will be collected for all the vessels included in the Fleet register for the vessels that during the reference year (2009) had more than one day of effort and, for the variables on capacity, for all the vessels included on the fleet registry regardless of the level of activity."

In future years, Croatia should present this sort of information in the general part of the transversal variables chapter or in other subchapter

III.G - Research surveys at sea

- MS should provide a map with the Medits hauls in the Croatian waters and not the map (see figure 1) with the complete Medits Mediterranean survey. Figure 1 should be replaced with more detailed ones illustrating only the Croatians Medits hauls.

- There is a mismatch between the number of Medits hauls reported in the table III.G.1 (60 hauls) and the number of hauls reported in the text (100 hauls). MS is requested to check and eventually correct it.

- MS should always refer to the must update version of the Medits manual.

- In table III.G.3, MS stated that Medias data are uploaded in an international database but then no description of this database is reported in the text. MS should better clarify it.

III.G.3 Data Presentation

- In this paragraph should be clearly reported and specify when the final checked and validated surveys data could be available to all potential end users.

IVA - Aquaculture data

- Species are to be specified.

- Segmentation shall be according the guidelines. But MS has promised to do so when data are presented in AR.

IV.B - Data on Processing industry

- Croatia is advised to make use of the Structural Business Statistics as far as possible.

- Croatia mentions problems with employment data. MS is advised that segmentation of the sector is not mandatory, only if applied it should be by employment categories.

- Nothing is mentioned concerning the employment data by gender. Croatia should be aware that this gender specific data collection has to be done not only for aquaculture but also for processing industry. A brief confirmation that Croatia will be aware of the gender specific employment data collection should be send to the Commission.

V - Module of evaluation of the effects of the fishing sector on the marine ecosystem

- Table V.1, namely “Indicators to measure the effects of fisheries on the marine ecosystem”, is completely missing from the NP. MS should insert and complete the mentioned table.

VI - Module for management and use of the data

No remarks.

Sections VII, VIII and IX

No remarks.

X - References

MS should check the references and update this paragraph with the most recent ones (i.e. RCMMed&BS reports, STECF, PGMed etc.).

* Note even though the Guidelines refer to this Commission Decision, since the publication of the Guidelines, this Commission decision has been replaced by Commission decision 2010/93/EU.

6 ANNEX II EVALUATION OF LITHUANIAN NP 2013 UPDATE

General issues:

In the Lithuanian NP 2013 update, it is still not clear how the MS is intending to avoid the shortfalls with regard to sampling the fisheries & stocks beyond the Baltic Sea, i.e. "high-seas fisheries" in the North Sea & Eastern Arctic, North Atlantic and Other regions. Apparently, there have been attempts/requests for regional task-sharing and bi-/multilateral agreements, but none of these have resulted in concrete joint sampling plans. Since 2013 has already started, the MS is advised not to wait for the forthcoming Regional Coordination Meetings, but to actively seek cooperation with other MS fishing in the same areas/on the same stocks in order settle written agreements as basis for derogations for own sampling activities.

Requests for derogations for sampling the "high-seas fleet" and the stocks it is fishing on are not provided, although clearly requested in the "Guidelines for the submission of National Programme Proposals on the National Data Collection Programmes..." and "Guidelines for the amendment of National Programmes 2011-13 for the year 2013".

With regard to the data that currently is not being collected from the high-seas fleet, the MS seems to follow the route of "the data end-users never ask for our data", but written proof from e.g. stock assessment working groups has not been provided that their data are not relevant, not needed or will never be used. It would be desirable that the MS actively seeks contact to the end-users, clarifies their needs with regard to the MS data and reacts accordingly.

A summary of the proposed amendments, as requested in the "Guidelines for the amendment of National Programmes 2011-13 for the year 2013", is missing. Also, justifications for the amendments and a description of their impact on data quality and coverage have not been provided by the MS.

II.B International coordination and international scientific meetings

No explanation is given why no participation is planned for meetings that are relevant for MS, e.g. WKNARC, WKPICS3, SGPIDS, NAFO meetings, WKIND, WKBALT and SGVMS.

III.C Biological metier-related variables - Baltic Sea

III.C.2 Estimation procedures: information on catch sampling added (presumably based on implementation of Reg. 404/2011), as well as usage of COST and FishFrame, which is all welcome.

III.C.5 Regional coordination: RCM Baltic 2011 recommendations and responsive actions were added. One of the ideas of NP updates until the end of Oct., however, is to incorporate latest RCM recommendations, which has not been done here. The RCM Baltic 2012 report (final version) has been available on 19 Oct 2012, so it should have been used here.

III.C Biological metier-related variables – North Sea & Eastern Arctic

III.C.5 Regional coordination: RCM NS&EA 2011 recommendations and responsive actions were added. The RCM NS&EA 2012 (draft) report, however, has not been used here.

III.C.6 Derogations and non-conformities: Argumentation on the redundancy of at-sea-sampling due to a discard ban for certain species in Norwegian waters is invalid, as e.g. the ICES Arctic Fisheries Working Group (AFWG) is indeed incorporating discard information from all nations fishing in the NE Arctic region. MS is advised to contact the data users (e.g. ICES AFWG, NWWG) again regarding the need for metier-based (and stock) data for assessment purposes. If MS data are not needed, it would be preferable that the AFWG/NWWG reports clearly state this, and MS would be advised to request these statements from the WG chairs, in order to obtain a confirmed basis for eventual derogations for sampling. Another route to follow would be to seek regional/multilateral/bilateral agreements with other MS (as announced in section III.C.1).

III.C Biological metier-related variables – Other regions (Long-distance fisheries)

This section could have been merged with the previous one, as the described fisheries are now dealt with the RCM North Sea and Eastern Arctic. Part of the text (e.g. RCM recommendations) thus is redundant.

III.C.5 Regional coordination: RCM LDF 2011 recommendations and responsive actions were added. The RCM LDF 2012 (draft) report, however, has not been used here.

III.D Recreational fisheries

III.D.1 Data acquisition: Information on a pilot study on eels in 2011 was added (presented in Lithuanian Annual Report 2011). Programme on cod angling will be continued in 2013.

III.D.5 Regional coordination: Information on ICES PGRFS 2010 added. There has been a PGRFS 2011 and WGRFS 2012, however, and reports have been available before October 2012. The reference to the "RCM LDF 2011" should be amended to "RCM Baltic 2011".

III.E Biological stock-related variables - Baltic Sea

III.E.4 Regional coordination: RCM Baltic 2011 recommendation and responsive action was added. No RCM Baltic 2012 recommendations mentioned (see comments under III.C).

Standard tables: Latin name for herring: *Harengusmembras* should be replaced by the valid name *Clupeaharengus*.

Economic variables

General:

The amended NP does not contain a summary of the proposed amendments neither a date of submission on the front page.

Assessment: Makes evaluation not easier, but as the evaluation has been done, not of major importance. In the future please follow the guidelines.

Fleet Economics

- III.B.1: PIM Method will now be used by LT for capital cost and value, and they provide a minor clarifications of data sources.

Assessment: Major change and improvement according the guidelines!

- III.B.3: MS added method for the case, that less than 70% response will be achieved: “In the case when response rate is less than 70%, coefficient of variation will be used as indicator of accuracy.”

Assessment: Improvement!

- III.B.5: Update of responsive action on recommendation from RCM Baltic. It remains unclear, why this is presented under “other regions” and not under Baltic Sea, North Sea and Eastern Arctic, and North Atlantic. For each region all topics (Data acquisition, estimation etc. including regional coordination) should be presented.

Assessment: If the regional coordination chapter is meant to cover all regions, for this time it could be accepted. In the future please follow the guidelines.

- III.B.6: Non presentation of high sea vessels economic performance due to confidentiality has been deleted. Also reference to a meanwhile executed pilot study has been deleted.
- Assessment: Improvement as more detailed data will be provided.

Transversal Variables

- No changes/amendments

Aquaculture

- No aquaculture data collection executed as only freshwater species are cultured. Only wording “The next pilot study is foreseen in 2011” deleted.
- Assessment: Only minor update of text.

Processing Industry

- There is only very minor update of wording of data source. No substantial changes, even it should be updated for the case where response rate may be lower than 70%, compare fleet module, where “In the case when response rate is less than 70%, coefficient of variation will be used as indicator of accuracy.” But this was not covered by former evaluation.
- Assessment: No major change.

All modules - Tables:

- There has been no changes/amendments in the tables related to Fleet/Transversal/Aquaculture and Processing Variables/Parameters.
- Assessment: Not necessary as there are no changes. (But species in table IV.A.1 should be given where requested).

Conclusion:

As there are only minor amendments with the exemption of the newly introduced application of the PIM Method to calculate capital cost/value in the fleet module (which is an improvement as it is necessary according the guidelines), no resubmission of the NP would have been required according to the evaluators view.

7 ANNEX III UPDATED GUIDELINES FOR THE SUBMISSION OF ANNUAL REPORTS ON THE NATIONAL DATA COLLECTION PROGRAMMES UNDER COUNCIL REGULATION (EC) 199/2008, COMMISSION REGULATION (EC) 665/2008 AND COMMISSION DECISION 2010/93/EU

**Guidelines for the submission of
Annual Reports on the
National Data Collection Programmes under
Council Regulation (EC) 199/2008,
Commission Regulation (EC) 665/2008
and Commission Decision 2010/93/EU**

Version 2013

Table of contents

Purpose of the Guidelines

Year of application and periodical revision of the Guidelines

Circulation of the Guidelines

Deadline for the submission of Annual Report

Evaluation of the Annual Report

Scope of the Annual Report

Format of the Annual Report

General section layout

Standard tables

Revised versions of Annual Report and standard tables

Derogations and non-conformities

AR sections

1. General framework

II. National data collection organisation

III. Module of evaluation of the fishing sector

IV. Module of the evaluation of the economic situation of the aquaculture and processing industry

V. Module of evaluation of the effects of the fishing sector on the marine ecosystem

VI. Module for management and use of the data

VII. Follow-up of STECF recommendations

VIII. List of acronyms and abbreviations

IX. Comments, suggestions and reflections

X. References

XI. Annexes

Purpose of the Guidelines

The Guidelines for the submission of Annual Reports under the framework Council Regulation (EC) 199/2008, and implementing Commission Regulation (EC) 665/2008 and Commission Decision 2010/93/EU (the 'Data Collection Framework' or DCF), are intended to help Member States (MS) in producing Annual Reports that contain all the necessary information for evaluation by the Scientific, Technical and Economic Committee on Fisheries (STECF) and the European Commission (EC).

Years of application and periodical revision of the Guidelines

The present document contains the 2013 version of the Guidelines, based on a review of the Guidelines established by the [STECF](#) expert group EWG 11-18 (Salerno, 17 – 21 October 2011) and endorsed by STECF plenary (Brussels, November 2011), as well as amendments proposed by EWG 12-08 (Hamburg, 25-29 June 2012) and endorsed by STECF by written procedure in July 2012. These Guidelines are designed for reporting the achievements from the ARs 2011-2013.

The present revision of the guidelines (~~December 2011~~ March 2013) replaces the ~~following sections (text and tables)~~ of the 2012 version of the guidelines.:

~~III.B Economic variables~~

~~IV Module of the evaluation of the economic situation of the aquaculture and processing industry~~

~~Table III.B.1 – Population segments for collection of economic data~~

~~Table III.B.3 – Economic Data collection strategy~~

~~Table III.F.1 – Transversal Variables Data collection strategy~~

~~Table IV.A.3 – Sampling strategy – Aquaculture sector~~

~~Table IV.B.2 – Sampling strategy – Processing industry~~

Tables of NP can be maintained as in the original formats because suggested revision only relate to information that should be given in the AR and not in NP, the so called “grey columns” (such as accuracy indicators).

Circulation of the Guidelines

The Guidelines will be circulated by the EC to the MS through their National Correspondents. This will be done well in advance of the AR submission deadlines, so that MS are always provided in time with the most recent version of the Guidelines.

The Guidelines will also be available on JRC's data collection web pages:

<https://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu> (Documents > Technical Reports (TR) and Annual Reports > Guidelines > [most recent year] > Guidelines)

Deadline for the submission of Annual Report

Following the provisions of the DCF, the deadline for the submission of the AR is 31 May of the year following the sampling year. MS are urged to scrupulously respect this deadline. Delays in submission will lead to reductions in the financial assistance (Reg. 199/2008 Article 8, 5.(a); Reg. 665/2008, Article 6(1)). In addition, this may prevent evaluation of the overdue AR by STECF, and delay the final approval and financial assistance by the EC.

Evaluation of the Annual Report

Every year, subsequently to the submission of the AR, an STECF Expert Working Group (EWG) shall evaluate their conformity and the scientific relevance of the data to be covered and also the quality of the proposed methods and procedures (Article 6 of Reg. 199/2008).

With regard to the outcomes, STECF shall evaluate the execution of the NPs approved by the EC and the quality of the data collected by the MS (Article 7 of Reg. 199/2008).

EWG's conclusions and recommendations will be laid down in its summer meeting report, for subsequent endorsement by STECF and further consideration by the EC.

It was stressed that regarding the submission of the NP proposals and the ARs, Article 2 and 5 of Commission Regulation 665/2008 clearly stipulate that MSs have the obligation to use the guidelines and templates established by STECF.

Scope of the Annual Report

The primary aim of the AR is to allow STECF to evaluate:

- What has been achieved by MS in fulfilment of the requirements of the DCF.
- The reasons for any deviation from the plan (methodology, objectives, ...).
- The non-conformity in the AR with the provisions of the DCF.

The AR should particularly address the above aspects of the data collection programmes, in a brief but sufficiently comprehensive way.

Format of the Annual Report

The AR should be provided in two physical documents, one file containing the main report and one file containing the standard tables in an Excel compatible file (also see Section 'Standard tables' below). Annexes (if any) should be physically part of the main report, not in separate files.

Plain text should be formatted in Times New Roman, font size 11 or 12.

Coloured graphs and charts should be avoided unless their complexity is such that the use of grey scales only makes reading difficult.

The AR file for the main body of the report should be named as follows:

- Country_Annual_Report_Reference-year_Text_Submission-date.

Example: Belgium_Annual_Report_2012~~09~~_Text_31-May-2013~~4~~.

The AR file containing the standard tables should be named as follows

- Country_Annual_Report_Reference-year_Tables_Submission-date.

It may be that the AR documents will be revised after STECF evaluation. Only the latest version should be available under the JRC's Data Collection web site.

Important notice: Financial reports are for the attention of the Commission only (they are not evaluated by STECF) and therefore, should be provided in a separate file, using the standard tables issued by the Commission. It is advisable however, to name the financial report file following the same rules that apply to the files with the AR itself. Example: Belgium_Financial_Report_31-May-2013~~4~~.

Language

MS are encouraged to submit their AR in English, in order to avoid delays in the evaluation process. STECF is aware that the EC cannot oblige MS to submit their AR in English, but stresses that doing so is in the MS's own interest: (a) it helps to speed up the evaluation process, and (b) it prevents translation errors and hence mis-interpretation by the evaluators.

General section layout

The AR should have the following sections and sub-sections, referring to the structure of Commission Decision 2010/93/EU.

I	General framework
II	National data collection organisation
II A	National correspondent and participating institutes
II B	Regional and International coordination
II B 1	Attendance of International meetings
II B 2	Follow-up of regional and international recommendations
III	Module of the evaluation of the fishing sector
III A	General description of the fishing sector
III B	Economic variables
III B 1	Achievements: results and deviation from NP proposal
III B 2	Data quality: results and deviation from NP proposal
III B 3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations
III B 4	Actions to avoid shortfalls
III C	Metier-related variables
III C 1	Achievements: results and deviation from NP proposal
III C 2	Data quality: results and deviation from NP proposal
III C 3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations
III C 4	Actions to avoid shortfalls
III D	Recreational fisheries
III D 1	Achievements: results and deviation from NP proposal
III D 2	Data quality: results and deviation from NP proposal
III D 3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations
III D 4	Actions to avoid shortfalls
III E	Stock-related variables
III E 1	Achievements: results and deviation from NP proposal
III E 2	Data quality: results and deviation from NP proposal
III E 3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations
III E 4	Actions to avoid shortfalls
III F	Transversal variables
III F 1	Capacity
III F 1 1	Achievements: results and deviation from NP proposal
III F 1 2	Data quality: results and deviation from NP proposal
III F 1 3	Actions to avoid shortfalls
III F 2	Effort
III F 2 1	Achievements: results and deviation from NP proposal
III F 2 2	Data quality: results and deviation from NP proposal
III F 2 3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations
III F 2 4	Actions to avoid shortfalls
III F 3	Landings
III F 3 1	Achievements: results and deviation from NP proposal
III F 3 2	Data quality: results and deviation from NP proposal
III F 3 3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations
III F 3 4	Actions to avoid shortfalls
III G	Research surveys at sea
III G 1	Achievements: results and deviation from NP proposal
III G 2	Data quality: results and deviation from NP proposal
III G 3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations
III G 4	Actions to avoid shortfalls

IV Module of the evaluation of the economic situation of the aquaculture and processing industry

IV A Collection of data concerning the aquaculture

IV A 1 Achievements: results and deviation from NP proposal

IV A 2 Data quality: results and deviation from NP proposal

IV A 3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations

IV A 4 Actions to avoid shortfalls

IV B Collection of data concerning the processing industry

IV B 1 Achievements: results and deviation from NP proposal

IV B 2 Data quality: results and deviation from NP proposal

IV B 3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations

IV B 4 Actions to avoid shortfalls

V Module of evaluation of the effects of the fishing sector on the marine ecosystem

V 1 Achievements: results and deviation from NP proposal

V 2 Actions to avoid shortfalls

VI. Module for management and use of the data

VI 1 Achievements: results and deviation from NP proposal

VI 2 Actions to avoid shortfalls

VII Follow-up of STECF recommendations

VIII List of acronyms and abbreviations

IX Comments, suggestions and reflections

X References

XI Annexes

The layout of the AR and the numbering of the sections should strictly be adhered to.

Details on the expected contents of each section and sub-section of the AR are given in sections I-XI of the Guidelines.

Standard tables

The Guidelines come with a unique set of standard tables which has already been used for the NP proposals. Several technical improvements were introduced in the version 201309 of the standard table templates, ~~the principal one being that the same tables are used for both NP proposal and AR. Columns shaded in grey have been added to the relevant tables and should be left blank when submitting the NP proposal but completed when submitting the AR to document achievements compared with the data collection proposed in the NP proposal. In addition, two full tables that are entirely shaded in grey have been added (III.C.6, VI.B.1), and are for completion only in the AR.~~ The standard tables should be submitted as a separate file, and in an Excel compatible format, avoiding the use of pdf or other non compatible formats. No cells should be deleted from the tables (apart from the example rows) and no columns should be added. Comments should be listed at the end of the tables as footnotes or explained in the AR text.

All standard tables have entries for 'NP Years' and, when relevant, an entry for 'AR year'. 'NP Years' must refer to the ~~biannual NP proposal 2009-2010 or triannual~~ annual NP proposal 2011-2013. The entry for 'AR year', shaded in grey, is to be filled at the time of producing the AR and refers to the year when the data were collected.

Printer settings of the standard tables are pre-defined, so that the tables can readily be printed. MS are kindly requested not to change these settings.

Details on which tables go with which Modules and sections of the DCF and on the types of data that should be included in the tables (and their formatting), are given in Sections I-XI of the Guidelines. When filling in the tables, MS should closely follow the instructions and not to leave cells blank when

they should have a "No". An empty space in a cell that should have a "No" is very confusing, as it may mean both a "No" or a forgotten entry.

Planned sampling numbers (trips, individuals etc.) from the NP should match exactly with those of the AR.

Revised versions of Annual Report and standard tables

Revisions of AR and/or standard tables (e.g. because omissions or errors were discovered after the original had been sent to the EC) are acceptable, provided that the revised versions are forwarded in due time for consideration by STECF.

Should a revision be necessary MS shall submit a revised version of the entire AR with all modified paragraphs (not single figures, words or sentences), table entries and graph titles highlighted in red font, to allow easy identification of the sections that were changed. Revised versions of the AR should be named following the same rules as for the initial versions (see section 'Format' above).

Only the latest version of the AR and standards tables should be available on the JRC Data Collection web site.

Consistent naming and codification, compliance with conventions

In order to allow full comparability within and between MS reports, consistent naming and codification of gears, species, métiers, fishing grounds etc. – according to the DCF and other international conventions including those established at Regional Co-ordination Meetings (RCMs) – has to be applied throughout text and tables of the reports.

"Other regions" should be presented in oneregional chapter per section and not separately by CECAF, ICCAT etc. R(FM)Os should be specified within these chapters. The same division is to be followed in the standard tables, i.e. columns "Region" and "RFMO".

AR sections

GENERAL FRAMEWORK

Outline the general framework of the achieved national data collection programme in relation to the relevant version(s) of the DCF. Also mention which year of activities is covered by the Annual Report and whether there have been major methodological changes in approach compared to the year(s) before. MS should indicate in which section(s) these changes appear.

In this section, MS should provide an updated list of derogations, including those added during the reference year, using the following table format:

<u>Short title of derogation</u>	<u>NP proposal section</u>	<u>Type of data - Variables</u>	<u>Region</u>	<u>Derogation approved or rejected</u>	<u>Year of approval or rejection</u>	<u>Reason / Justification for derogation</u>
-	-	-	-	-	-	-
-	-	-	-	-	-	-
-	-	-	-	-	-	-

MS should clearly state what provisions in Commission Decision 2010/93/EU the derogation is based on (e.g. exemption rule of a specific module) or which regional/bilateral/multi-lateral agreement is made reference to.

NATIONAL DATA COLLECTION ORGANISATION

II.A National correspondent and participating institutes

Give name and contact details of the national correspondent (postal address, phone and fax number, e-mail). Give full name, acronym and contact details of all institutes that will contribute to the NP (postal address, phone and fax number, website – if any).

Information on a national DCF website (ref. Commission Regulation 665/2008 article 8(2)) should be given.

Give an overview of the national co-ordination meetings that have been held, and an outline of their main outcomes.

II.B Regional and International coordination

II.B.1 Attendance of international meetings

Use standard table II.B.1. to indicate which meetings have been attended by MS. Indicate the reasons for non attendance at planned meetings. Use final reference list of eligible meetings provided by the Commission.

Description of the extra fields in the table II.B.1: Planned International co-ordination

Fields	Description/definition of the fields
Attendance	Indicate by 'Yes' or 'No' which of the listed meetings, MS have effectively attended.

II.B.2 Follow-up of regional and international recommendations

List the recommendations from [the Liaison Meeting relevant to the AR year](#)~~all relevant RCMs~~ which are not dealt with a specific section of the report (also see the text table on next page) and give a brief description of the responsive actions taken. Use sub-headers to make the distinction between the different RCMs, and print recommendations and responses in a different font style (e.g. bold and/or italic for the recommendations and normal text for the descriptions of the action taken). There is no need to also list recommendations that do not apply to MS (e.g. on the terms of reference of ICES expert groups, on actions to be taken by the EC, etc.). [Only LM recommendations relevant to the AR year should be listed.](#)

~~In doing so, you may have to go back several years in time and refer to RCM reports of more than one year ago. Most of the RCM recommendations and proposed actions will only take effect in the year following the actual meeting of the RCM and the actions taken by MS will only become visible in the Annual Reports that are submitted two or three years later.~~

MODULE OF THE EVALUATION OF THE FISHING SECTOR

III.A General description of the fishing sector

Indicate the major changes in the fishing sector which had an impact on the implementation of the National Programme, if any.

III.B Economic variables

[Insert here supra-region header, according to Appendix II of Commission Decision 2010/93/EU. For each supra region, sections III.B.1-4 should be given.]

III.B.1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Update standard tables III.B.1, III.B.2 with the information collected during the sampling year.

Description of fields in the table III.B.1: Population segments for collection of economic data

Fields	Description/definition of the fields
Achieved Sample no.	Achieved sample no. should refer to the no. of respondents (and not for instance to the number of questionnaires actually sent) The no. of respondents should refer to the survey (unit response rate) and not to the variables (item response rate)
Achieved Sample rate	Achieved sample no./frame population no The no. of respondents should refer to the survey (unit response rate) and not to the variables (item response rate).
Achieved sample rate / planned sample rate	Automatic filling with the figures achieved vs. planned

Table III.B.1 should be filled in separately for each individual data source/survey performed. [Insert separate lines for each sampling scheme per segment.](#)

Description of fields in the table III.B.2: Economic Clustering of fleet segments

Fields	Description/definition of the fields
---------------	---

Total number of vessels in the cluster by the 1st of January of the sampling year	Updated number of vessels comprised in each of the clusters.
Number of vessels in the segment by the 1st of January of the sampling year	Updated number of vessels comprised in each of the fleet segments.

Table III.B.2 should contain information on clustered segments, while information on clustering and on unclustered segments is to be provided in Tables III.B.1 and III.B.3.

List the shortfalls (if any) in the achieved data collection compared to what was planned in the relevant NP proposal, and explain the reasons for the shortfalls. Explain any deviation from the sampling intensity proposed, the methods used for collecting data and for estimating the parameters.

MS should follow NP proposal. In the case of changes in the methodology during the year, MS should provide information regarding the changes in the AR.

MS are reminded of the fact that the DCF has no provisions for the exclusion of any part of the vessel population from data collection (by means of thresholds for, e.g., fishing effort, quantities landed, revenues, etc.). If, nonetheless, part of the fleet was excluded from data collection, the reasons for this should be thoroughly explained and justified.

If the scheme for clustering fleet segments has changed during the AR year, the c~~Clustering of fleet segments~~ should be described and information should be given on the segments that are clustered, as required by the DCF and following STECF recommendations. MS should distinguish between segments considered for clustering as follows:

1. Important segments with distinct characteristics;
2. Segments similar to other segments;
3. Non-important segments with distinct characteristics.

Importance of fleet segments should be assessed in terms of landings (value and volume) and/or effort. Similarity should be demonstrated using expert knowledge on fishing patterns or on available data on landings and/or effort.

For each of the cases described, MS should apply the following approaches for clustering according to the different characteristics of fleet segments:

1. Important segments with distinct characteristics

Such segments should not be clustered unless strictly necessary in data reporting for confidentiality reasons. Data should be separately collected for these segments and included in national totals (unless separate identification is then made possible as a consequence).

2. Segments similar to other segments

Such segments can be clustered for sampling purposes, as well as for confidentiality reasons. The segments merged should be selected according to criteria that should be fully explained and justified by the MS. In particular, the approach to determine similarity should be clearly described by the MS.

3. Non-important segments with distinct characteristics

Such segments can be clustered for sampling purposes, as well as for confidentiality reasons. These segments can be merged with other non-important segments. Clustering of these segments with other important segments should be avoided. MS should explain how the lower importance had been

determined and for which reasons the clustered segments have been selected. Standard Table III.B.2 should report the segments that have been clustered. Clusters should be named after the biggest segment in terms of number of vessels or economic significance.

A specific section should include a description of methods and assumptions made for estimation of capital value and capital costs. This section should answer to the following questions:

1. Which are the reference values taken into account for the estimation of the Price per Capacity Unit, PCU (e.g. book value, second hand market, etc...)?
2. Which estimation methods and/or models have been used to estimate the PCU?
3. If a net value has been used, what is the method used to calculate the gross value? (e.g. formula, figures from the balance sheets, etc...)?
4. What type of index price series have been used (e.g. heavy machinery index, etc...)?
5. What depreciation rates? From where do they come (e.g. national legislation, general scheme excel spreadsheet, etc...)?
6. Which age schedule (service life time) has been used?
7. What is the share of each asset on the total value of the capital?

III.B.2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Update standard tables III.B.3 with the values of the accuracy indicators.

Description of fields in the table III.B.3: Economic Data collection strategy

Fields	Description/definition of the fields
Achieved sample rate	Provide the value of the indicator as defined in the following table "Indicators of accuracy"
Response rate	
CV	
Other variability indicators	Only in case of in case of Non probability sampling

CVs should be reported in absolute numbers (e.g. 0.012) instead of percentages.

The capital value (apart from the value of quota and other fishing rights), capital costs and transversal variables should not be reported in Table III.B.3. Information regarding transversal data should only be presented in table III.F.1.

~~In case of census with a very low achieved response rate (<70%), MS has to evaluate the representativeness of the data collected on the respondents.~~

Accuracy indicators have to be reported for each fleet segment and for each variable.

In case that a variable is not applicable in a MS (e.g. income from fishing rights), it should not be left blank, but marked as "NA" in table III.B.3.

Definition of the “Indicators of accuracy” to be presented by MS in the AR

Type of data collection	Accuracy indicators	Definition and presentation
A: Census	Response rate	achieved no ⁽¹⁾ / frame population no. <i>Present as %</i>
	Coverage rate	total value of production of the respondent units/total value of production of the frame population <i>Presented as %</i>
	Coefficient of Variation (CV) only if response rate <70% ⁽²⁾	$cv(\hat{Y}) = \frac{\hat{\sigma}(\hat{Y})}{\hat{Y}}$ where: $\hat{\sigma}(\hat{Y})$ is the estimate standard deviation of \hat{Y} \hat{Y} is the estimated total value per fleet segment of the variable e.g. total energy costs ⁽³⁾ <i>Presented as absolute term (0.2 rather than 20%)</i>
B: Probability Sample survey C: Non-Probability Sample survey	Achieved sampling rate	achieved sample no. ⁽⁴⁾ /frame population no. <i>Presented as %</i>
	Coverage rate	total value of production of the respondent units/total value of production of the frame population <i>Presented as %</i>
	Response rate	achieved sample no.(4)/ planned sample no. ⁽⁵⁾ <i>Presented as %</i>
	Coefficient of Variation (CV)	$cv(\hat{Y}) = \frac{\hat{\sigma}(\hat{Y})}{\hat{Y}}$ where: $\hat{\sigma}(\hat{Y})$ is the estimated standard deviation of \hat{Y} \hat{Y} is the estimate of the total ⁽³⁾ <i>Presented as absolute term (0.2 rather than 20%)</i>

(1) **Achieved no.** is the number of respondents who supplied data in response to the census

(2) **CV** is also required for census which achieves a low response rate (<70%) as this must be treated as if it were a Non-Probability Sample survey

(3) The **estimated total** is the final estimate for each variable and each fleet segment, according to appendix VI of DCF. E.g. estimated total energy costs, estimated total crew costs, per fleet segment

(4) **Achieved sample no.** is the number of respondents that supply data (and not, for instance, the number of questionnaires sent out, or number of companies contacted)

(5) **Planned sample no.** is the number of units to be contacted for the survey (even though you may not expect all of them to respond and supply data)

MS has to provide qualitative description regarding the assessment of quality of data collected.

MS has to describe other variability indicators calculated in case of Non probability sampling in the text and provide the results of calculation in the table III.B.3.

MS has to provide CV of total estimates. In the case of non probability sample survey (or census with <70% response rate), MS should also provide CV of observed values (e.g. in column Other variability indicators).

In case of derived indicators, such as FTE, MS should provide the information about calculation procedures and accuracy indicators of based data collected. The data collected for this purpose should be stated in the report and accuracy indicators should be presented in the AR text ~~Table III.B.3.~~

List the shortfalls (if any) in the achieved accuracy compared to what was planned in the relevant NP proposal, and explain the reasons for the shortfalls.

III.B.3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations

List the appropriate recommendations from ~~all relevant RCMs~~ the Liaison Meeting (LM) relevant to the AR year related to the economic variables and give a brief description of the responsive actions taken. Use sub-headers to make the distinction between the different RCMs, and print recommendations and responses in a different font style (e.g. bold and/or italic for the recommendations and normal text for the descriptions of the action taken). There is no need to also list recommendations that do not apply to MS. Only LM recommendations relevant to the AR year should be listed.

~~In doing so, you may have to go back several years in time and refer to RCM reports of more than one year ago. Most of the RCM recommendations and proposed actions will only take effect in the year following the actual meeting of the RCM and the actions taken by MS will only become visible in the Technical Reports that are submitted two or three years later.~~

III.B.4 Actions to avoid shortfalls

Briefly describe the actions that will be considered / have been taken to avoid the shortfalls in the future and when these actions are expected to produce effect. If there are no shortfalls, then this section can be skipped.

III.C Metier-related variables

[Insert here region header, according to Appendix II of Commission Decision 2010/93/EU. For each region, sections III.C.1-4 should be given.]

III.C.1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Update standard tables III.C.3, III.C.4, III.C.5 and III.C.6 with the information collected during the sampling year. Codes for sampling frames in Tables III.C.3 and III.C.4 should match exactly.

Description of fields in the table III.C.3: Expected sampled trips by metier

Fields	Description/definition of the fields
Total No. of trips during the Sampling year	Update the value given in the NP proposal (previous column)
Achieved number of trips	This field is the sum of the following fields
Achieved number of trips	Provide the number of achieved number of trips sampled at sea

at sea	
Achieved number of trips on shore	Provide the number of achieved number of trips sampled on shore

Description of fields in the table III.C.4: Metier sampling strategy

Fields	Description/definition of the fields
Total No. of trips during the Sampling year	Update the value given in the NP proposal (previous column)
Achieved number of trips	This field is the sum of the following fields
Achieved number of trips at sea	Provide the number of achieved number of trips sampled at sea
Achieved number of trips on shore	Provide the number of achieved number of trips sampled on shore
% achieved	Automatic filling with the achieved vs planned number of trips sampled.

Description of fields in the table III.C.5: Sampling intensity for length ~~and age~~ compositions (all metiers combined)

Fields	Description/definition of the fields
Achieved length/ age sampling from the unsorted catches	Number of fish measured during the year for the variable (length -or-age) expressed in column H. Use this field only if the sampling is done at-sea without indication whether the fish is discarded or retained.
Precision (CV) achieved on unsorted catches	Precision achieved on the length or age distribution relative to the previous column.
Achieved length/ age sampling from the retained catches and/or landings	Number of fish measured during the year for the variable (length -or-age) expressed in column H, and for the retained and landed fraction, i.e. combining information at-sea and on shore.
Precision (CV) achieved on retained catches and/or landings	Precision achieved on the length or age distribution relative to the previous column.
Achieved length/ age sampling from the discards	Number of fish measured during the year for the variable (length -or-age) expressed in column H, and only for the discarded fraction coming from at-sea observations.
Precision (CV) achieved on discards	Precision achieved on the length or age distribution relative to the previous column.
Achieved number of fish measured at national level	Automatic filling with the sum of the fields N, P and R.
Precision (CV) achieved on volume of discards	Precision achieved on the total weight of discards

Description of fields in the table III.C.6: Achieved ~~L~~length sampling of catches, landings and discards by metier and species

Fields	Description/definition of the fields
MS	Member State shall be given as three letter code eg. "GER"
MS participating in sampling	If the metier is sampled according to a regionally co-ordinated programme, give the names of all participating Member States. If the metier is sampled unilaterally, give the name of the single participating Member State.
Multi-lateral agreement	Indicate by 'Yes' or 'No' whether there is a bilateral agreement or not.
Sampling year	Year for achieved sampling. Information contained in this table should cover all years separately.
Region	Region shall be given according to the labelling of regions in Table III.A.1 e.g. "Baltic", "North Sea and Eastern Arctic", etc.
R(FM)O	<u>Enter the acronym of the competent Regional Fisheries Management Organisation (RFMO) for scientific body (e.g. ICES) for providing management/advice on the species/stock.</u>
Fishing ground	As defined in the relevant Regional Coordination Meetings.
Species	Use Latin name
Species Group	Group 1, 2 or 3 as defined in Commission Decision 2010/93/EU Appendix VII.
Metier level 6	Metier level 6 as defined in Commission Decision 2010/93/EU Appendix IV (1-5) metier level 6-, and codes given in section III.C.1(a).
Achieved length sampling from the unsorted catches	Number of fish measured during the year for the given species, fishing ground and metier. Use this field only if the sampling is done at-sea without indication whether the fish is discarded or retained.
Achieved length sampling from the retained catches and/or landings	Number of fish measured during the year for the given species, fishing ground and metier. Use this field for the measurement done on the retained and landed fraction, i.e. combining information at-sea and on shore
Achieved length sampling from the discards	Number of fish measured during the year for the given species, fishing ground and metier. Use this field for the measurement of the discarded fraction coming from at-sea observations.
Achieved number of fish measured at a national level by metier.	Number of fish measured during the year for the given species, fishing ground and metier. This field is the sum of the number of fish measured over all catch fractions and sampling source.

List the shortfalls (if any) in the achieved data collection compared to what was planned in the relevant NP proposal, and explain the reasons for the shortfalls. Explain any deviation from the sampling intensity proposed, the methods used for collecting data and for estimating the parameters.

~~With respect to achieved sampling for age, the numbers in the table should refer to the numbers of fish sampled for age, not to the number of age readings actually performed. Otoliths or any other calcified structures may have been collected, but the age readings may not have been performed yet, pending e.g. the outcome of an age reading workshop, the purchase of new age reading equipment, etc. Nevertheless, the mere fact that the samples were taken is considered to be part of the MS's achievements and therefore, they should be included in the table.~~

Shortfalls of less than 10 % from the plan are considered to be an acceptable operational margin for length ~~and age~~ sampling, and need not be justified.

In the event of 'over-sampling' (= sampling more than 50% above what was planned by the MS), an explanation should be given on the scientific or other reasons for the 'over-sampling'. It is also worth mentioning whether the excess sampling was at the MS's national expense or not. Excess sampling of

less than 50 % above the target is considered to be an acceptable operational margin for length ~~and age~~ sampling and need not be justified.

III.C.2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Update standard tables III.C.5 with the values of the precision ~~accuracy~~ indicators (CV). CVs should be reported in absolute numbers (e.g. 0.012) instead of percentages.

List the shortfalls (if any) in the achieved precision ~~accuracy~~ compared to what was planned in the relevant NP proposal, and explain the reasons for the shortfalls.

Note: Precision estimates should be calculated as the weighted average of CVs over all length/~~age~~ classes. The weight to be used is the total estimated number of individuals per length/~~age~~ classes.

III.C.3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations

List the appropriate recommendations from the Liaison Meeting (LM) relevant to the AR year ~~all relevant RCMs~~ related to the metier-related variables and give a brief description of the responsive actions taken. Print recommendations and responses in a different font style (e.g. bold and/or italic for the recommendations and normal text for the descriptions of the action taken). There is no need to also list recommendations that do not apply to MS (e.g. on the terms of reference of ICES expert groups, on actions to be taken by the EC, etc.). Only LM recommendations relevant to the AR year should be listed.

~~In doing so, you may have to go back several years in time and refer to RCM reports of more than one year ago. Most of the RCM recommendations and proposed actions will only take effect in the year following the actual meeting of the RCM and the actions taken by MS will only become visible in the Annual Reports that are submitted two or three years later.~~

III.C.4 Actions to avoid shortfalls

Briefly describe the actions that will be considered / have been taken to avoid the shortfalls in the future and when these actions are expected to produce effect. If there are no shortfalls, then this section can be skipped.

III.D Recreational fisheries

[Insert here region header, according to Appendix II of Commission Decision 2010/93/EU. For each region, sections III.C.1-4 should be given.]

III.D.1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Briefly describe which data were collected and how the relevant information was obtained (census, questionnaires, etc.). Use table III.D.1 to insert planned and achieved numbers of samples.

If the MS obtained derogation for the collection of landings data on recreational fisheries, then it should explicitly be mentioned in this section.

List the shortfalls (if any) in the achieved data collection compared to what was planned in the relevant NP proposal, and explain the reasons for the shortfalls. Explain any deviation from the sampling intensity proposed, the methods used for collecting data and for estimating the parameters.

III.D.2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

List the shortfalls (if any) in the achieved precision ~~accuracy~~ compared to what was planned in the relevant NP proposal, and explain the reasons for the shortfalls. ~~s.~~

III.D.3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations

List the appropriate recommendations from the Liaison Meeting (LM) relevant to the AR year ~~all relevant RCMs~~ related to the recreational fisheries and give a brief description of the responsive actions

taken. Print recommendations and responses in a different font style (e.g. bold and/or italic for the recommendations and normal text for the descriptions of the action taken). There is no need to also list recommendations that do not apply to MS (e.g. on the terms of reference of ICES expert groups, on actions to be taken by the EC, etc.). Only LM recommendations relevant to the AR year should be listed.

~~In doing so, you may have to go back several years in time and refer to RCM reports of more than one year ago. Most of the RCM recommendations and proposed actions will only take effect in the year following the actual meeting of the RCM and the actions taken by MS will only become visible in the Annual Reports that are submitted two or three years later.~~

III.D.4 Actions to avoid shortfalls

Briefly describe the actions that will be considered / have been taken to avoid the shortfalls in the future and when these actions are expected to produce effect. If there are no shortfalls, then this section can be skipped.

III.E Stock-related variables

[Insert here region header, according to Appendix II of Commission Decision 2010/93/EU. For each region, sections III.E.1-4 should be given.]

III.E.1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Update standard table III.E.3 with the information collected during the sampling year.

Description of fields in the table III.E.3: Sampling intensity for stock-based variables

Fields	Description/definition of the fields
Achieved precision target (CV)	Indicate the value of the achieved precision as defined in Commission Decision 2010/93/EU.
Is target precision achieved at a regional level?	Indicate by 'Yes' or 'No' whether the objective was attained at a regional level.
Achieved No of individuals at a national level	Number of individuals measured at a national level.
Achieved No of individuals at the regional level	Number of individuals measured at a regional level, i.e. compiling the number of individuals measured by all MS participating in the agreed sampling plan.
% achievement at national (100*Q/M)	Automatic filling with the figures achieved vs planned.
% achievement regional (100*R/N)	Automatic filling with the figures achieved vs planned.

List the shortfalls (if any) in the achieved data collection compared to what was planned in the relevant NP proposal, and explain the reasons for the shortfalls. Explain any deviation from the sampling intensity proposed, the methods used for collecting data and for estimating the parameters.

With respect to achieved sampling for variables related to age, the numbers in the table should refer to the numbers of fish collected, not to the number of age readings actually performed. Otoliths or any other calcified structures may have been collected, but the age readings may not have been performed yet, pending e.g. the outcome of an age-reading workshop, the purchase of new age-reading

equipment, etc. Nevertheless, the mere fact that the samples were taken is considered to be part of the MS's achievements and therefore, they should be included in the table.

Shortfalls of less than 10 % from the plan are considered to be an acceptable operational margin for length and age sampling, and need not be justified.

In the event of 'over-sampling' (= sampling more than 50% above what was planned by the MS), an explanation should be given on the scientific or other reasons for the 'over-sampling'. It is also worth mentioning whether the excess sampling was at the MS's national expense or not. Excess sampling of less than 50 % above the target is considered to be an acceptable operational margin for length and age sampling and need not be justified.

III.E.2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Update standard table III.E.3 with the values of the precision accuracy indicators. CVs should be reported in absolute numbers (e.g. 0.012) instead of percentages.

List the shortfalls (if any) in the achieved precision accuracy compared to what was planned in the relevant NP proposal, and explain the reasons for the shortfalls..

Precision estimates should be calculated following the provisions of the DCF (Commission Decision 2010/93/EU section B.B2.4).

III.E.3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations

List the appropriate recommendations from the Liaison Meeting (LM) relevant to the AR year and relevant RCMs related to the stock-related variables and give a brief description of the responsive actions taken. Print recommendations and responses in a different font style (e.g. bold and/or italic for the recommendations and normal text for the descriptions of the action taken). There is no need to also list recommendations that do not apply to MS (e.g. on the terms of reference of ICES expert groups, on actions to be taken by the EC, etc.). Only LM recommendations relevant to the AR year should be listed.

~~In doing so, you may have to go back several years in time and refer to RCM reports of more than one year ago. Most of the RCM recommendations and proposed actions will only take effect in the year following the actual meeting of the RCM and the actions taken by MS will only become visible in the Annual Reports that are submitted two or three years later.~~

III.E.4 Actions to avoid shortfalls

Briefly describe the actions that will be considered / have been taken to avoid the shortfalls in the future and when these actions are expected to produce effect. If there are no shortfalls, then this section can be skipped.

III.F Transversal variables

III.F.1 Capacity

III.F.1.1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Update standard table III.F.1 with the information collected during the sampling year.

Description of fields in the table III.F1: Transversal Variables Data collection strategy

Fields	Description/definition of the fields
Achieved sample rate	Provide the value of the indicator as defined in the table "Indicators of accuracy" reported in section III.B.2
Response rate	

List the shortfalls (if any) in the achieved data collection compared to what was planned in the relevant NP proposal, and explain the reasons for the shortfalls.:-

MS are reminded of the fact that the DCF^R has no provisions for the exclusion of any part of the vessel population from data collection (by means of thresholds for, e.g., fishing effort, quantities landed, revenues, etc.). If, nonetheless, part of the fleet was excluded from sampling, the reasons for this should be thoroughly explained and justified.

III.F.1.2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Update standard table III.F.1 with the values of the accuracy indicators. DCF data quality achievements for data which is mandatory to be collected under a different EU legislation (e.g. Reg. 26/2004 and 1224/2009) do not have to be reported in table III.F.1.

List the shortfalls (if any) in the achieved accuracy compared to what was planned in the relevant NP proposal, and explain the reasons for the shortfalls..

Precision estimates should be calculated following the provisions of the DCF (Commission Decision 2010/93/EU[€] section B.B2.4).

III.F.1.3 Actions to avoid shortfalls

Briefly describe the actions that will be considered / have been taken to avoid the shortfalls in the future and when these actions are expected to produce effect. If there are no shortfalls, then this section can be skipped.

III.F.2 Effort

III.F.2.1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Update standard table III.F.1 with the information collected during the sampling year.

List the shortfalls (if any) in the achieved data collection compared to what was planned in the relevant NP proposal, and explain the reasons for the shortfalls.:-

MS are reminded of the fact that the DCF^R has no provisions for the exclusion of any part of the vessel population from data collection (by means of thresholds for, e.g., fishing effort, quantities landed, revenues, etc.). If, nonetheless, part of the fleet was excluded from sampling, the reasons for this should be thoroughly explained and justified.

III.F.2.2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Update standard table III.F.1 with the values of the accuracy indicators. DCF data quality achievements for data which is mandatory to be collected under a different EU legislation (e.g. Reg. 26/2004 and 1224/2009) do not have to be reported in table III.F.1.

List the shortfalls (if any) in the achieved accuracy compared to what was planned in the relevant NP proposal, and explain the reasons for the shortfalls..

Precision estimates should be calculated following the provisions of the DCF (Commission Decision 2010/93/EU[€] section B.B2.4).

III.F.2.3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations

List the appropriate recommendations from the Liaison Meeting (LM) relevant to the AR year and all relevant RCMs related to the effort variables and give a brief description of the responsive actions taken. Print recommendations and responses in a different font style (e.g. bold and/or italic for the recommendations and normal text for the descriptions of the action taken). There is no need to also list

recommendations that do not apply to MS (e.g. on the terms of reference of ICES expert groups, on actions to be taken by the EC, etc.). Only LM recommendations relevant to the AR year should be listed.

~~In doing so, you may have to go back several years in time and refer to RCM reports of more than one year ago. Most of the RCM recommendations and proposed actions will only take effect in the year following the actual meeting of the RCM and the actions taken by MS will only become visible in the Annual Reports that are submitted two or three years later.~~

III.F.2.4: Actions to avoid shortfalls

Briefly describe the actions that will be considered / have been taken to avoid the shortfalls in the future and when these actions are expected to produce effect. If there are no shortfalls, then this section can be skipped.

III.F.3 Landings

III.F.3.1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Update standard table III.F.1 with the information collected during the sampling year.

List the shortfalls (if any) in the achieved data collection compared to what was planned in the relevant NP proposal, and explain the reasons for the shortfalls.

MS are reminded of the fact that the DCF~~R~~ has no provisions for the exclusion of any part of the vessel population from data collection (by means of thresholds for, e.g., fishing effort, quantities landed, revenues, etc.). If, nonetheless, part of the fleet was excluded from sampling, the reasons for this should be thoroughly explained and justified.

III.F.3.2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Update standard table III.F.1 with the values of the accuracy indicators. DCF data quality achievements for data which is mandatory to be collected under a different EU legislation (e.g. Reg. 26/2004 and 1224/2009) do not have to be reported in table III.F.1.

List the shortfalls (if any) in the achieved accuracy compared to what was planned in the relevant NP proposal, and explain the reasons for the shortfalls..

Precision estimates should be calculated following the provisions of the DCF (Commission Decision 2010/93/EU~~C~~ section B.B2.4).

III.F.3.3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations

List the appropriate recommendations from the Liaison Meeting (LM) relevant to the AR year ~~all relevant RCMs~~ related to the landings and give a brief description of the responsive actions taken. Print recommendations and responses in a different font style (e.g. bold and/or italic for the recommendations and normal text for the descriptions of the action taken). There is no need to also list recommendations that do not apply to MS (e.g. on the terms of reference of ICES expert groups, on actions to be taken by the EC, etc.). Only LM recommendations relevant to the AR year should be listed.

~~In doing so, you may have to go back several years in time and refer to RCM reports of more than one year ago. Most of the RCM recommendations and proposed actions will only take effect in the year following the actual meeting of the RCM and the actions taken by MS will only become visible in the Annual Reports that are submitted two or three years later.~~

III.F.3.4 Actions to avoid shortfalls

Briefly describe the actions that will be considered / have been taken to avoid the shortfalls in the future and when these actions are expected to produce effect. If there are no shortfalls, then this section can be skipped.

III.G Research surveys at sea

III.G.1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Update standard table III.G.1 with the information collected during the sampling year.

Description of fields in the table III.G.1: List of surveys

Fields	Description/definition of the fields
Achieved days at sea	Number of days at sea actually achieved.
Achieved target	Value of target related to the column 'Type of sampling activities', actually achieved.
% achievement no of days (A/P %)	Automatic filling with the figures achieved vs. planned
% achievement target (A/P %)	Automatic filling with the figures achieved vs. planned

List the shortfalls (if any) in the achieved data collection compared to what was planned in the relevant NP proposal, and explain the reasons for the shortfalls. Explain any deviation from the number of days at sea and the target objectives of the surveys. Shortfalls of less than 10 % from the target are considered to be an acceptable operational margin for sea-going surveys and need not be justified.

If a survey had covered more than one type of activity, MS should insert separate lines for each type of activity.

A map with achieved sampling activities is to be included in the main body of the Annual Report (references to the column 'map' given in standard table III.G.1).

III.G.2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

List any point that would likely impair the quality of the indices (if any), such as change in settings of the gear, imperfect geographical coverage, and explain the reasons for the shortfalls.

III.G.3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations

List the appropriate recommendations from the Liaison Meeting (LM) and Survey Planning Groups relevant to the AR year all relevant RCMs related to research surveys at sea and give a brief description of the responsive actions taken. Print recommendations and responses in a different font style (e.g. bold and/or italic for the recommendations and normal text for the descriptions of the action taken). There is no need to also list recommendations that do not apply to MS (e.g. on the terms of reference of ICES expert groups, on actions to be taken by the EC, etc.). Only LM recommendations relevant to the AR year should be listed.

~~*In doing so, you may have to go back several years in time and refer to RCM reports of more than one year ago. Most of the RCM recommendations and proposed actions will only take effect in the year following the actual meeting of the RCM and the actions taken by MS will only become visible in the Annual Reports that are submitted two or three years later.*~~

III.G.4 Actions to avoid shortfalls

Briefly describe the actions that will be considered / have been taken to avoid the shortfalls in the future and when these actions are expected to produce effect. If there are no shortfalls, then this section can be skipped.

MODULE OF THE EVALUATION OF THE ECONOMIC SITUATION OF THE AQUACULTURE AND PROCESSING INDUSTRY

IV.A Collection of data concerning the aquaculture

IV.A.1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Update standard tables IV.A.2 with the information collected during the sampling year.

Description of fields in the table IV.A.2: Population segments for collection of aquaculture data

List the shortfalls (if any) in the achieved data collection compared to what was planned in the relevant NP proposal, and explain the reasons for the shortfalls. Explain any deviation from the sampling intensity proposed, the methods used for collecting data and for estimating the parameters.

MS
are

Fields	Description/definition of the fields
Achieved Sample no.	Achieved sample no. should refer to the no. of respondents (and not for instance to the number of questionnaires actually sent) The no. of respondents should refer to the survey (unit response rate) and not to the variables (item response rate)
Achieved Sample rate	Achieved sample no./frame population no The no. of respondents should refer to the survey (unit response rate) and not to the variables (item response rate).
Achieved sample rate / planned sample rate	Automatic filling with the figures achieved vs. planned

reminded of the fact that the DCFR has no provisions for the exclusion of any part of the population from data collection (by means of thresholds for, e.g., number of employees, quantities produced, revenues, etc.). If, none-theless, part of the aquaculture sector was excluded from sampling, the reasons for this should be thoroughly explained and justified.

IV.A.2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Update standard tables IV.A.3 with the values of the accuracy indicators (for definition of indicators see Table “Indicators of accuracy” under section III.B.2. of guidelines).

Description of fields in the table IV.A.3: Sampling strategy – Aquaculture sector

Fields	Description/definition of the fields
Achieved sample rate	Provide the value of the indicator as defined in the table “Indicators of accuracy” reported in section III.B.2
Response rate	
CV	
Other variability indicators	Only in case of in case of Non probability sampling

CVs should be reported in absolute numbers (e.g. 0.012) instead of percentages. If a CV cannot be reported because it is taken from Structural Business Statistics (SBS) and the National Statistical Office does not provide the data, please indicate this by 'N.A.SBS'.

In case of census with a very low achieved response rate (<70%), MS has to evaluate the representativeness of the data collected on the respondents.

MS should describe other variability indicators calculated in case of Non probability sampling in the text and provide the results of calculation in the table IV.A.3.

MS should provide CV of total estimates (see table “Indicators of accuracy” in III.B.2). In the case of non probability sample survey (or census with <70% response rate), MS should also provide CV of observed values (e.g. in column Other variability indicators).

List the shortfalls (if any) in the achieved accuracy compared to what was planned in the relevant NP proposal, and explain the reasons for the shortfalls.

IV.A.3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations

List the appropriate and actual recommendations from ~~all the~~ relevant ~~RCMs~~ Liaison Meetings related to the aquaculture variables and give a brief description of the responsive actions taken. Use sub-headers to make the distinction between the different RCMs, and print recommendations and responses in a different font style (e.g. bold and/or italic for the recommendations and normal text for the descriptions of the action taken). There is no need to also list recommendations that do not apply to MS (e.g. on the terms of reference of ICES expert groups, on actions to be taken by the EC, etc.).

IV.A.4 Actions to avoid shortfalls

Briefly describe the actions that will be considered / have been taken to avoid the shortfalls in the future and when these actions are expected to produce effect. If there are no shortfalls, then this section can be skipped.

IV.B Collection of data concerning the processing industry

IV.B.1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Update standard tables IV.B.1 with the information collected during the sampling year.

Description of fields in the table IV.B.1: Processing industry -Population segments for collection of economic data

List the shortfalls (if any) in the achieved data collection compared to what was planned in the relevant NP proposal, and explain the reasons for the shortfalls. Explain any deviation from the sampling intensity proposed, the

Fields	Description/definition of the fields
Achieved Sample no.	Achieved sample no. should refer to the no. of respondents (and not for instance to the number of questionnaires actually sent) the no. of respondents should refer to the survey (unit response rate) and not to the variables (item response rate)
Achieved Sample rate	Achieved sample no./frame population no the no. of respondents should refer to the survey (unit response rate) and not to the variables (item response rate).
Achieved sample rate / planned sample rate	Automatic filling with the figures achieved vs planned

methods used for collecting data and for estimating the parameters.

MS are reminded of the fact that the ~~DCFR~~ has no provisions for the exclusion of any part of the population from data collection (by means of thresholds for, e.g., number of employees, quantities produced, revenues, etc.). If, none-theless, part of the processing industry was excluded from sampling, the reasons for this should be thoroughly explained and justified.

IV.B.2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Update standard tables IV.B.2 with the values of the accuracy indicators (for definition of indicators see Table “Indicators of accuracy” under section III.B.2.).

Description of fields in the table IV.B.2: Sampling strategy – Processing Industry

Fields	Description/definition of the fields
Achieved sample rate	Provide the value of the indicator as defined in the table “Indicators of accuracy” reported in section III.B.2
Response rate	
CV	
Other variability indicators	Only in case of in case of Non probability sampling

CVs should be reported in absolute numbers (e.g. 0.012) instead of percentages.

In case of census with a very low achieved response rate (<70%), MS has to evaluate the representativeness of the data collected on the respondents

MS should describe other variability indicators calculated in case of Non probability sampling in the text and provide the results of calculation in the table IV.B.2.

MS should provide CV of total estimates (see table “Indicators of accuracy” in III.B.2). In the case of non probability sample survey (or census with <70% response rate), MS should also provide CV of observed values (e.g. in column Other variability indicators).

List the shortfalls (if any) in the achieved accuracy compared to what was planned in the relevant NP proposal, and explain the reasons for the shortfalls.

IV.B.3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations

List the appropriate and actual recommendations from all relevant [RCMs-Liaison Meetings](#) related to the fish processing variables and give a brief description of the responsive actions taken. Use sub-headers to make the distinction between the different RCMs, and print recommendations and responses in a different font style (e.g. bold and/or italic for the recommendations and normal text for the descriptions of the action taken). There is no need to also list recommendations that do not apply to MS.

IV.B.4 Actions to avoid shortfalls

Briefly describe the actions that will be considered / have been taken to avoid the shortfalls in the future and when these actions are expected to produce effect. If there are no shortfalls, then this section can be skipped.

MODULE OF EVALUATION OF THE EFFECTS OF THE FISHING SECTOR ON THE MARINE ECOSYSTEM

V.1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Update standard tables V.1 with the information collected during the sampling year.

Description of fields in the table V.1: Indicators to measure the effects of fisheries on the marine ecosystem

Fields	Description/definition of the fields
Effective time lag for availability	Indicate the time lag for availability of the collected information.
Time interval for position reports	Indicate the time interval for position reports, for the indicators necessitating the VMS information.

List the shortfalls (if any) in the achieved data collection compared to what was planned in the relevant NP proposal, and explain the reasons for the shortfalls. Explain any deviation from the sampling intensity proposed, the methods used for collecting data and for estimating the parameters

V.2 Actions to avoid shortfalls

Briefly describe the actions that will be considered / have been taken to avoid the shortfalls in the future and when these actions are expected to produce effect. If there are no shortfalls, then this section can be skipped.

MODULE FOR MANAGEMENT AND USE OF THE DATA

VI.1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Use standard tables VI.1 with the information collected during the sampling year.

Description of fields in the table VI.1: Achieved data transmission

Fields	Description/definition of the fields
MS	Member State shall be given as three letter code e.g. "GER"
Expert Group or Project	Acronym of the RFMO and the expert group or project
Species or Fleet segment	Use the Latin name for the species and the name of the fleet segment for economic variables.
Area/Stock	Indicate for which area/stock the information related to one species was sent to the Expert Group or Project.
Types of data transmitted	Indicate with an 'X' under the relevant column, which type of data was sent to the Expert Group or Project.

List the shortfalls (if any) in the achieved actions compared to what was planned in the relevant NP proposal, and explain the reasons for the shortfalls. Explain any deviation from the planned development of the databases and the planned processing, analysing and estimating of the parameters.

[Provide details on progress in national data management.](#)

VI.2 Actions to avoid shortfalls

Briefly describe the actions that will be considered / have been taken to avoid the shortfalls in the future and when these actions are expected to produce effect. If there are no shortfalls, then this section can be skipped.

FOLLOW-UP OF STECF RECOMMENDATIONS

In its evaluation of the NP Proposals and Annual Reports, ~~the STECF~~~~GRN EWGs~~ makes general comments that have an impact on the way MS are expected to set up their national data collection programmes in the years to come (see the General Comments sections at the beginning of ~~STECF EWG SGRN's summer and winter~~ reports). In the ensuing ARs, however, it is sometimes difficult to ascertain whether MS have properly followed these recommendations. MS should summarise the follow-up given to ~~SGRN's STECF~~ recommendations ~~and endorsed by STECF~~ in a text table comprising on the left side the recommendations and on the right side the responsive actions. MS should state explicitly if there are no relevant recommendations to address.

LIST OF ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

Provide a full list, in alphabetical order, of all acronyms and abbreviations used in the main body of the AR, together with their meaning in plain language.

COMMENTS, SUGGESTIONS AND REFLECTIONS

Use this section to comment on general problems encountered while planning or executing the NP, to indicate inconsistencies in the DCF, to suggest improvements, etc.

REFERENCES

Provide a full list of bibliographic references used in the main body of the AR and in the standard tables, in alphabetical order.

ANNEXES

Use this section to add methodological overviews, working papers, etc., that are essential to the understanding and evaluation of the AR. Annexes should be concise and have the general structure and layout of a scientific paper.

8 EWG-13-02 LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

1 - Information on STECF members and invited experts' affiliations is displayed for information only. In some instances the details given below for STECF members may differ from that provided in Commission COMMISSION DECISION of 27 October 2010 on the appointment of members of the STECF (2010/C 292/04) as some members' employment details may have changed or have been subject to organisational changes in their main place of employment. In any case, as outlined in Article 13 of the Commission Decision (2005/629/EU and 2010/74/EU) on STECF, Members of the STECF, invited experts, and JRC experts shall act independently of Member States or stakeholders. In the context of the STECF work, the committee members and other experts do not represent the institutions/bodies they are affiliated to in their daily jobs. STECF members and invited experts make declarations of commitment (yearly for STECF members) to act independently in the public interest of the European Union. STECF members and experts also declare at each meeting of the STECF and of its Expert Working Groups any specific interest which might be considered prejudicial to their independence in relation to specific items on the agenda. These declarations are displayed on the public meeting's website if experts explicitly authorized the JRC to do so in accordance with EU legislation on the protection of personnel data. For more information: <http://stecf.jrc.ec.europa.eu/adm-declarations>

STECF members		
Name	Address	Email
Alvaro Abella	ARPAT, Livorno, Italy	alvarojuan.abella@arpat.toscana.it
Christoph Stransky	Thuenen Institute of Sea Fisheries, Hamburg, Germany	christoph.stransky@ti.bund.de
Eskild Kirkegaard	DTU Aqua, Copenhagen, Denmark	ek@aqu.dtu.dk
Jenny Nord	Swedish Agency for Marine and Water Management, Göteborg, Sweden	jenny.nord@havochvatten.se

Invited experts		
Name	Address	Email
Angeles Armesto	IEO-Instituto Español de Oceanografía, Vigo, Spain	angeles.armesto@vi.ieo.es
Cecile Brigaudeau	des requins et des hommes, Brest, France	cecile@desrequinsetdeshommes.org
Christian Dintheer	Ifremer, Nantes, France	christian.dintheer@ifremer.fr
Ciaran Kelly	Marine Institute, Galway, Ireland	ciaran.kelly@marine.ie
Constantin Stroie	NAFA Romania, Bucharest, Romania	cstroie@ymail.com
Els Torreele	ILVO Fisheries Belgium, Ostend, Belgium	els.torreele@ilvo.vlaanderen.be
Emmanuil Koutrakis	NAGREF-FRI, Kavala, Greece	manosk@inale.gr
Evelina Carmen Sabatella	IREPA, Salerno, Italy	esabatella@irepa.org
Frans van Beek	IMARES, IJmuiden, Netherlands	frans.vanbeek@wur.nl
Jarno Juhani Virtanen	FGFRI, Helsinki, Finland	jarno.virtanen@rktl.fi

Jose Rodriguez	Instituto Español de Oceanografía, Santander, Spain	jose.rodriguez@st.ieo.es
Katja Ringdahl	Swedish Agricultural University, Lysekil, Sweden	katja.ringdahl@slu.se
Michael Ebeling	Thünen Institute, Hamburg, Germany	Michael.Ebeling@vti.bund.de
Michael James Armstrong	Cefas, Lowestoft, United Kingdom	mike.armstrong@cefas.co.uk
Sieto Verver	IMARES, IJmuiden, Netherlands	sieto.verver@wur.nl

JRC experts		
Name	Address	Email
Arina Motova	EC JRC, Ispra, Italy	arina.motova@jrc.ec.europa.eu
Cristina Ribeiro	EC JRC, Ispra, Italy	cristina.ribeiro@jrc.ec.europa.eu
Hans Joachim Raetz	EC JRC, Ispra, Italy	hans-joachim.raetz@jrc.ec.europa.eu

European Commission		
Name	Address	Email
Amelie Knapp	EC DG MARE, Brussels, Belgium	Amelie.KNAPP@ec.europa.eu
Bas Drukker	EC DG MARE, Brussels, Belgium	Bas.Drukker@ec.europa.eu
Fabrizio Natale	EC JRC, Ispra, Italy	fabrizio.natale@jrc.ec.europa.eu

Observers		
Name	Address	Email
Carmen Fernandez	ICES, Copenhagen, Denmark	cferllxx@gmail.com

9 LIST OF BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS

Background documents are published on the meeting's web site on:
<http://stecf.jrc.ec.europa.eu/web/stecf/ewg1302>

List of background documents:

1. EWG-13-02 – Doc 1 - Declarations of invited and JRC experts (see also section 12 of this report – List of participants)

European Commission

EUR 25972 EN – Joint Research Centre – Institute for the Protection and Security of the Citizen

Title: Scientific, Technical and Economic Committee for Fisheries, Review of DC MAP – Part 1 (STECF-13-07).

STECF members: Casey, J., Abella, J. A., Andersen, J., Bailey, N., Bertignac, M., Cardinale, M., Curtis, H., Daskalov, G., Delaney, A., Döring, R., Garcia Rodriguez, M., Gascuel, D., Graham, N., Gustavsson, T., Jennings, S., Kenny, A., Kirkegaard, E., Kraak, S., Kuikka, S., Malvarosa, L., Martin, P., Motova, A., Murua, H., Nord, J., Nowakowski, P., Prellezo, R., Sala, A., Scarcella, G., Simmonds, J., Somarakis, S., Stransky, C., Theret, F., Ulrich, C., Vanhee, W. & Van Oostenbrugge, H.

EWG-13-02 members: Armesto, A., Armstrong, M. J., Brigaudeau, C., Dintheer, C., Ebeling, M., Kelly, C., Koutrakis, E., Motova, A., Rätz, H. J., Ribeiro, C., Ringdahl, K., Rodriguez, J., Sabatella, E. C., Stroie, C., Torreele, E., van Beek, F., Verver, S., Virtanen, J., Wojcik, I.,

Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union

2013 – 50 pp. – 21 x 29.7 cm

EUR – Scientific and Technical Research series – ISSN 1831-9424 (online), ISSN 1018-5593 (print)

ISBN 978-92-79-29906-3

doi:10.2788/90141

Abstract

The Expert Working Group meeting of the Scientific, Technical and Economic Committee for Fisheries EWG 13-02 was held from 11 – 15 March 2013 in Ispra–Italy. The main task of the group was to evaluate options proposed by DG MARE on the new EU Multi-annual programme for data collection (MAP) 2014-2020. This report is about the following additional tasks included terms of reference for the meeting: to evaluate of the Croatian National Programme 2013, to evaluate the proposed amendments to the Lithuanian National Programme for 2013 and to update of the Annual Report Guidelines. The report was reviewed by the STECF in its April 2013 plenary meeting.

How to obtain EU publications

Our priced publications are available from EU Bookshop (<http://bookshop.europa.eu>), where you can place an order with the sales agent of your choice.

The Publications Office has a worldwide network of sales agents. You can obtain their contact details by sending a fax to (352) 29 29-42758.

As the Commission's in-house science service, the Joint Research Centre's mission is to provide EU policies with independent, evidence-based scientific and technical support throughout the whole policy cycle.

Working in close cooperation with policy Directorates-General, the JRC addresses key societal challenges while stimulating innovation through developing new standards, methods and tools, and sharing and transferring its know-how to the Member States and international community.

Key policy areas include: environment and climate change; energy and transport; agriculture and food security; health and consumer protection; information society and digital agenda; safety and security including nuclear; all supported through a cross-cutting and multi-disciplinary approach.

The Scientific, Technical and Economic Committee for Fisheries (STECF) has been established by the European Commission. The STECF is being consulted at regular intervals on matters pertaining to the conservation and management of living aquatic resources, including biological, economic, environmental, social and technical considerations.